R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that USP 6,002,798 ("Palmer et al") does not relate to the storing of medical image data, and for this reason the Examiner has cited USP 5,917,536 ("Kunimoto et al") to supply the missing teachings of Palmer et al.

It is respectfully submitted, however, that even the combination of Palmer et al and Kunimoto et al fails to disclose, teach or suggest the feature of the present invention as recited in claim 1 whereby <u>when an inputting section inputs a data set including medical image data of a patient and ID data of the patient, a retrieving section judges whether the information memorizing section has already memorized a data set that includes the same ID data as the inputted ID data</u>, and when the inputted ID data is the same as previously memorized ID data, the inputted data set is correlated with the data set that includes the same ID data and the inputted medical image data is memorized as medical image data of the same patient as the memorized data set including said same ID data in the information memorizing section.

That is, it is respectfully submitted that even the combination of Palmer et al and Kunimoto et al fails to disclose,

teach or suggest the feature of the claimed present invention whereby the act of inputting a data set (which includes ID data and medical image data) includes: (i) identifying whether data corresponding to the same ID data has already been stored, and (ii) correlating the newly input data set with the previously stored data set, and memorizing the newly inputted medical image data as medical image data of the same patient as the memorized data set including the same ID data in the information memorizing section.

By contrast, Palmer et al merely discloses separately performed steps of (i) inputting one or more documents and (ii) retrieving one or more documents. Although the Examiner contends that the act of retrieving one or more documents in Palmer et al (column 7, lines 54-64) corresponds to the correlation of newly input medical image data and ID data according to the claimed present invention, it is respectfully pointed out that the retrieval step performed by Palmer et al is performed completely independently of the inputting of the documents.

More specifically, according to Palmer et al, when a document is scanned various document-structure recognition and text-recognition are performed, and the document is indexed based on the recognition of the document. For example, Palmer et al discloses recognizing title regions, body-text regions, and

figure-caption regions in the scanned document. Then, Palmer et al allows a user to select a level of indexing of the document for use in retrieving the document. If "Level 1" indexing is performed, then the document is indexed according to its title(s); "Level 2" indexing entails indexing based on the first line of body-text regions; "Level 3" indexing including indexing based on figure captions; and "Level 4" indexing is based on the full text of the document. See columns 6 and 7 of Palmer et al. Once the indexing and structural recognition is performed, the document is stored and the inputting of the document is complete. See Fig. 4 of Palmer et al. No determination is performed as to whether newly input ID data corresponds to previously stored ID data; no correlation is performed of the newly input data with previously input data; and the input image data is not memorized as data corresponding to previously input ID data.

In Palmer et al, previously stored documents may be searched using, for example, a Boolean search in a completely independent step that can even be performed on a different machine. See column 5, lines 38-48 of Palmer et al. Palmer et al, however, does not disclose that this retrieval can be performed together with the inputting of a document. Indeed, according to Palmer et al, the retrieval step becomes an option when inputting of data is <u>not</u> selected as a step to be performed. That is, as explained at column 5, lines 25-37 of Palmer et al, "[i]n step S302, if the

operator has selected to input documents, then the flow advances

to step S303 in which document image processing is performed,

after which flow returns to step S301 [the main selection menu].

<u>If the operator does not select document input but instead</u>

<u>selects to retrieve documents</u> (step S304) then flow advances to

step S305 in which document retrieval processing is executed"

(emphasis added). Thus, according to Palmer et al the document

retrieval cited by the Examiner is performed when inputting is

not performed.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Palmer et al

clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest the feature of the

present invention as recited in claim 1 whereby <u>when an inputting</u>

<u>section inputs a data set including medical image data of a</u>

<u>patient and ID data of the patient, a retrieving section judges</u>

<u>whether the information memorizing section has already memorized</u>

<u>a data set that includes the same ID data as the inputted ID</u>

<u>data</u>, and when the inputted ID data is the same as previously

memorized ID data, the inputted data set is correlated with the

data set that includes the same ID data and the inputted medical

image data is memorized as medical image data of the same patient

as the memorized data set including said same ID data in the

information memorizing section.

As recognized by the Examiner, Kunimoto et al discloses

storing MRI and CT images, along with text information such as

patient identifying information. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Kunimoto et al also clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest above described claimed features of the present invention as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if the teachings of Kunimoto et al were combinable with Palmer et al in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still achieve or render obvious an information memorizing section to memorize a plurality of data sets corresponding to a plurality of different patients, wherein the plurality of data sets include a plurality of different ID data identifying the plurality of different patients, as according to the present invention as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 12-14 depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over Palmer et al and Kunimoto et al, taken singly or in combination, under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103.

RE: PRIORITY DOCUMENT

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner fully acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents filed with the Original Application papers on February 27, 2002. In this connection, it is noted that in the

Office Action dated October 19, 2005, the Examiner checked box 12 on the Office Action Summary, but did not complete boxes a) and a)1 to fully acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents.

* *

Entry of this Response, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101
DH:iv